

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2004

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. 09/899,265 07/06/2001 Nevein T. Sultan 9-13528-170US 3921 EXAMINER 7590 -10/07/2004 Swabey Ogilvy Renault REFAI, RAMSEY Suite 1600 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 1981 McGill College Avenue Montreal, QC H3A 2Y3 2154 **CANADA**

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	,	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		09/899,265	SULTAN ET AL.		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Ramsey M Refai	2154	,	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commur or Reply	ication appears on the cover sho	et with the correspondence a	ddress	
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN risions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comi period for reply specified above, the maximum s re to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, nunication. 30) days, a reply within the statutory minimun tatutory period will apply and will expire SIX (y will, by statute, cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed n of thirty (30) days will be considered tim 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ely. communication.	
Status					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) fil	ed on <u>06 July 2001</u> .			
2a)□	•	n is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.			
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims	·	•		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict.	are withdrawn from consideratio			
Applicat	ion Papers				
	The specification is objected to by the drawing(s) filed on is/are		ed to by the Examiner.		
10/1	Applicant may not request that any obj				
11)[Replacement drawing sheet(s) includir The oath or declaration is objected	ng the correction is required if the di	rawing(s) is objected to. See 37	CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)⊡ a	Acknowledgment is made of a claim All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priorit Certified copies of the priorit Copies of the certified copies	y documents have been receive y documents have been receive s of the priority documents have ional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)	ed. ed in Application No be been received in this Nation).	al Stage	
2) Not	nt(s) ice of References Cited (PTO-892) ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 ier No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/15/2002</u> .	(PTO-948) Pa or PTO/SB/08) 5) ☐ No	erview Summary (PTO-413) per No(s)/Mail Date tice of Informal Patent Application (F her:	PTO-152)	

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 31 are presented for examination.

Priority

2. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120 as follows: This application is claiming the benefit of a prior filed nonprovisional application under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c). Copendency between the current application and the prior application is required.

Specification

3. The attempt to incorporate subject matter into this application by reference to U.S. Patent Application No. 09/742,310 is improper because applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 120. Applicant is required to delete this reference in the disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2154

4. Claims 25 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims are directed to software per se and render it non-statutory, unless implemented on a computer readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 5. <u>Claims 1-6, 9-10, 12-22, 25-26, and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tappan (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,421).</u>
- As per claim 1, Tappan teaches a method comprising steps of:
 asserting a route tag in respect of a link state advertisement (LSA) message (column 7, lines 14 67 and column 5, lines 5-15); and

controlling propagation of the LSA through the data network using the asserted internal route tag (column 7, lines 14 – 67 and column 5, lines 5-15).

7. As per claim 2, Tappan teaches the data network is an Open Shortest Path first (OSPF) network (abstract).

Art Unit: 2154

8. As per claim 3, Tappan teaches a route tag comprises one of: an internal route tag associated with an address located within an autonomous system of the data network; and an external route tag associated with an address located outside the autonomous system (Figure 3).

- 9. As per claim 4, Tappan teaches the step of asserting a route tag comprises steps of: setting a route tag value respecting the LSA; and inserting the route tag value into a predetermined field of the LSA (column 7, lines 14 67 and column 5, lines 5-15).
- 10. As per claim 5, Tappan teaches wherein the route tag value is set by a policy having a match criteria corresponding to a predetermined attribute of the LSA (column 1, line 40 column 2, lines 50 and column 6, lines 5-50).
- 11. As per claim 6, Tappan teaches wherein the predetermined attribute comprises any one or more of: a source address; a source area; a destination address; and a destination area (column 2, lines 3 50 and Figure 3).
- 12. As per claim 9, Tappan teaches the step of controlling propagation of the LSA comprises a step of implementing a forwarding policy having a match criteria corresponding to the asserted route tag (column 2, lines 3 50).

Art Unit: 2154

13. As per claim 10, Tappan teaches the forwarding policy corresponds to one of: a pass decision, in which the LSA is forwarded to a downstream link; and a discard decision, in which the LSA is discarded without forwarding (column 1, lines 41-47).

- 14. As per claim 14, Tappan teaches an autonomous system border router, and an area border router (abstract).
- As per claims 12 -13, 15 22, 25 26, and 28 29, these claims contain similar 15. limitations as claims 1-6, and 9-10 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 17. Claims 7-8, 23-24, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tappan (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,421) as per claim 1 above, in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted Prior Art).

Art Unit: 2154

18. As per claim 7, Tappan teaches the step of inserting the route tag comprises a step of inserting the route tag value into an external route tag field of the LSA (column 5, lines 5 - 15).

- 19. Tappan fails to teach the use of Type-5 LSA.
- 20. However, AAPA teaches the use of Type-5 LSA (paragraph [0007]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Tappan and AAPA because AAPA use of Type-5 LSA in Tappan's system would allow for advertisements to describe routes to destinations external to the Autonomous System.
- 21. As per claim 8, Tappan teaches the step of inserting the route tag comprises a step of inserting the route tag value into an internal route tag field (column 1, lines, 40-56 and column 2, lines 10-50).
- 22. Tappan fails to teach the use of Type-3 LSA.
- 23. However, AAPA teaches the use of Type-3 LSA (paragraph [0008]). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Tappan and AAPA because AAPA use of Type-3 LSA in Tappan's system would allow advertisements to describe routes to networks.
- 24. As per claims 23-24 and 30-31, these claims contain similar limitations as claims 7-8 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2154

25. Claims 11, 18, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Tappan (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,421) as per claim 1 above, in view of AAPA (Applicant Admitted

Prior Art) and in further view of Soloway et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,265,092).

- 26. As per claim 11, Tappan teaches the use LSA (abstract) and a forwarding table (policy) (column 2, lines 10-50).
- 27. Tappan fails to teach forwarding table-using information contained in the LSA as either one of: an inclusion route; and an exclusion route.
- 28. However AAPA teaches a forwarding table that contains inclusion routes (paragraph [0010]). AAPA fails to teach the use of exclusion routes in forwarding tables.
- 29. However, Soloway et al teaches using exclusion routes in forwarding tables (column 6, lines 35-60; when the switch detects, via LSP (link state packet), that the route/link is changed/down/affected, it stores the changed/down/affected route/link information in the forwarded table). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Tappan, AAPA, and Soloway et al because AAPA's use of inclusion routes in forwarding tables and Soloway et al's use of exclusion routes in forwarding tables in Tappan's system would provide for a way to control traffic flow within networks by using a forwarding policy that contains inclusion and exclusion routes which allow an ASBR to discard or pass selected packets according to these routes.
- 30. As per claims 18 and 27, these claims contain similar limitations as claim 11 above, therefore are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Cain (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,626)
- b. Fujita (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0032272)
- c. Rekhter (U.S. Patent No. 5,917,820)
- d. Zhang (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,492)
- e. Fukushima et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,524)
- f. Dobbins et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,825,772).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramsey M Refai whose telephone number is (703) 605-4361 (after November 1, 2004, (571) 272-3975). The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/899,265

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ramsey M Refai Examiner

Art Unit 2154

RMR

September 28, 2004

ZARNIMAUNG

PRIMARY EXAMINER